

## New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. Registered office: 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. Editor: Walter Dill Scott. Address: Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.50; 3 months, \$4.50.  
Sunday only, 1 year, \$4.00; 6 months, \$2.50; 3 months, \$1.50.

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$18.00; 6 months, \$10.50; 3 months, \$6.00.  
Sunday only, 1 year, \$5.00; 6 months, \$3.00; 3 months, \$1.75.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## A Sincere Interrogation Prompted by Natural Curiosity.

Do those whom a certain fondness for the obsolete phrase still moves us to call the leaders of the Republican Party desire to reflect Woodrow Wilson?

The thing can be done. In fact it can be done with ease and with merely incidental campaign activities, if only Penrose, Barnes, Gallinger and a certain number of equally eminent gentlemen turn their entire effort to the task.

The Democratic Party cannot save Mr. Wilson, but the Republican Party can save him as easily as it assumed the responsibility for electing him four years ago.

If the men who are running Republican affairs at the present moment believe that the people of the United States dislike or distrust Mr. Wilson as much as they despise these Republican leaders, The Tribune thinks that they are in error, in grievous error.

If the men who are running Republican Party affairs believe that they have millions of voters to deliver, because these voters are sufficiently eager to be rid of Mr. Wilson to begin again with them, The Tribune believes they are mistaken.

At the very least The Tribune can say this, that no such state of mind is discoverable about its own premises and it has neither surrendered its proxy to Mr. Barnes and Mr. Penrose nor committed itself to accept at the hands of these gentlemen a candidate whom they may select, not for the good of the country, nor of the Republican Party, but for their own good.

## Investigate Coal Prices.

Anthracite coal miners have announced a new schedule of rates, advancing wholesale prices from 10 to 30 cents a ton, and leaving only one size, of which little is sold, at the old rate. Retailers in Philadelphia, where the new schedule was made known, expressed the belief that the householder would be paying 50 cents a ton more for his fuel this fall.

In the face of this state of facts, it is to be hoped Attorney General Gregory's advice to the Federal Trade Commission to investigate operating costs and profits of the operators will be promptly followed. If the coal producers are using the excuse of increased wages for their miners to bleed the public far in excess of the increase in wages, it is only right that the fact be known and some redress be afforded the public. If, on the other hand, operating costs have risen far in excess of the total of the wages increase, as the operators claim, so that the public is not being required to pay huge additional profits to the coal producers, that should be set on the records in justice to them.

The public is suspicious. It has been bled before now, and fears the knife again. An official investigation such as Mr. Gregory proposed would settle the question and make the consumers feel a lot surer of obtaining a square deal.

## Too Much "Wire-tapping" Talk.

There has been a great deal of unnecessary tumult over the police "wire-tapping," and it is altogether probable that the Thompson committee, by its flamboyant investigation of the subject, has done much harm. It requires only a moment's calm consideration of the use the police have made of this power to realize that no ordinary, law-abiding citizen is likely to have his telephonic communications set down in shorthand by a police stenographer; and no business man or professional man need fear being interfered with unless his transactions are involved, somewhere along the line, with something detrimental to the public interest.

The telephone, in this age, is the crooks' ready aid. Since the telegraph company announced its abandonment of pool-room service, practically all the poolrooms of the city have relied on a telephone service. It was the telephone which summoned Barnett Buff from his office to the street, where he was murdered. Telephone conversations figured largely in the testimony of the trial of the murder case in which "Mike" Rofrano was alleged to be implicated. It was recorded telephone conversations which sent Senator Stilwell to Sing Sing for soliciting a bribe.

Any attempt to deprive the police of their power to "listen in" would be, to just that extent, a weakening of the forces of law and order. The mere fact that their power to do this has been so widely advertised is a blow to justice, since it is a widespread warning to all violators and

prospective violators of the laws to be careful of the telephone.

If the police are to have this power—and it is unthinkable that they should not have it—its exercise must be trusted to their judgment, just as many other things are trusted to their judgment. All that the investigation has shown so far is their discretion in handling such situations. Fortunately, the force is one, now, in which the public may well have confidence, and its Commissioner one whom certainly no person would accuse of misuse of the power conferred on him by the law.

## Josephus to the Scrap Heap.

The House Committee on Naval Affairs has repudiated Secretary Daniels and his five-year building programme. In so far as this vote—13 to 8 in the committee—represents a rebuke to the most incompetent Secretary the navy ever had, the country will rejoice at it.

The House committee showed last year a commendable zeal for the reorganization of the navy. It wanted to provide for expert military control and created a Bureau of Operations, intended to discharge the functions of a naval general staff. Secretary Daniels intrigued against this reform. The Bureau of Operations project was defeated in the House on a point of order, restored in the Senate and finally slaughtered, at Mr. Daniels's solicitation, in conference committee.

It is greatly to the credit of the House committee that it was very unwilling to accept the Secretary's leadership last year. It is equally to its credit that it openly rejects his leadership now. No one can any longer follow Mr. Daniels who sincerely desires to make the navy an efficient first line of defence. Mr. Daniels has neither the intelligence nor the will to recreate the navy. The sooner the two houses of Congress recognize that fact and begin to act on it the sooner we shall get a real start toward the reorganization of the navy on a sound, modern basis.

The recommendations of the majority of the committee are not ideal. Taken as part of a continuing programme, they might be criticised as being ill balanced. They make no provision for battleships; and the experience of the European war has not altered the conclusion that the battleship is still the principal reliance of all navies.

But this year's authorizations are not a part of a continuing programme, the committee having cast aside Mr. Daniels's five-year building project. Taken on their own merits as a one-year emergency contribution to the navy's strength, they are undeniably an improvement on Mr. Daniels's first year recommendations.

The committee provides for five battle-cruisers to the Secretary's two, four scout cruisers to his three, ten destroyers to his fifteen, twenty submarines to his thirty, and three auxiliaries to his one. The secretary recommended two battleships and the committee recommends none.

The greatest immediate need of the fleet is cruisers. Our battleships are far out of proportion in numbers to our scouts. Therefore it may be wise to concentrate for one year, at least, on construction for scouting purposes. Five battle-cruisers and four scout cruisers would be of immense value in rounding out our present fleet.

We do not need to make a splurge in submarines. In our coast defence problem the submarine can play only a subsidiary and local part, since if we cannot defend our enormous coast line with fighting ships we cannot hope to defend it through submarine sniping.

We should have been glad to see two battleships included in the committee's recommendations. But, apart from that deficiency, they are to be warmly approved. They break the shackles of a vicious control of our sea policy by a muddling Secretary in whom even his own party associates in Congress have now lost faith.

## Before the Irish Revolt.

A valuable and enlightening account of the activities of the Sinn Feiners in the last fifteen years is to be found in the current number of "The English Review." It is the more interesting because it was written and published before the landing of Sir Roger Casement or the insurrection in Dublin, and is therefore free from the adulteration of after thoughts or reflections colored by the ultimate event.

The author, Major Stuart-Stephens, claiming "lifelong knowledge of Irish subterranean political movements," shows no apprehension of a really dangerous revolution; as a military factor, indeed, he considers the organization "beneath contempt." But he takes pains to observe that "the existence of this organization constitutes a menace to Ireland's security," and by way of justifying his conviction he relates what he saw and heard when, last September, he made a journey through the southwest in order to follow out the ramifications of the Sinn Fein.

Even at that time there were rumors in Kerry of some such enterprise as that in which Sir Roger Casement was evidently engaged. He was conscious, he says, "of a curious feeling of unrest prevalent among a section of the fishing and farming classes of the sparse population of Kerry where it faces the North Atlantic." The story was current that some interned liners had escaped from our ports and were bound for the estuary of the Kenmare River, "packed with German-American reservists and members of the reconstituted Clan-na-Gael."

Major Stuart-Stephens admits the rumor was "almost incredible," but explains that "the gigantic bluff of a possible landing in Kerry was put forth by enemy emissaries just to test the temper of the Sinn Fein, to see whether they would welcome such a contingency, or would they think better of the security of their altars and their homes and at the last moment inform the British of the wrath that was coming." It appears that the experiment was successful, for no in-

formation was consciously given to those in authority.

It is curious to note that the sign that the Germans had put to sea was to be the receipt by post of a document resembling a local business circular, but in reality "a species of manifesto, printed in America." Fourteen hundred copies of this circular were seized at the General Postoffice in Cork. "Here, then," says the author, "is an instance of the working of the Irish rebel and the German spy."

Another discovery was that vast quantities of petrol had been stored in the cellars of the principal hotel of County Kerry, the lessee of which was an unnaturalized German. The accumulation of this supply began in the spring of 1914, but was checked when it was discovered that quantities had been dispatched to Valentia and several depots on the Kerry coast. According to Major Stuart-Stephens, many engaged in this risky traffic "have, with the assistance of German money, quitted Ireland for the States with such celerity that their exodus might, with strict propriety, be termed a flight."

An important point in his discussion of the situation is that he represents the military aspect as the least important. "The organization," he says, "can never procure more than a contemptible tale of arms, but the real danger lies in the word which is being passed round among the tillers of the soil." And he goes on to tell of the so-called Irish Race Convention held here the month before last, and to wonder at the simplicity of Sinn Feiners in falling in with the foolish sentiments expressed on that occasion. He admits, of course, that the Irish people have been the victims of "English selfishness and stupidity," that Ireland's history is "England's responsibility, her shame, her disgrace," and that "the charges that the Irish can bring against England are the most deadly that one European nation can bring against another." But what puzzles him is how any intelligent Irishman in Ireland could imagine that his country would profit by a German victory, "and I would," he adds, "with infinite respect, suggest to the Sinn Fein that the way to cure Erin is no more by helping to aid in Britain's defeat than the way to cure a legacy of gout is by murdering the present descendant of your great-grandfather's wine merchant."

## Pasting the Union Label on Art.

There is a good, steady fund of humor in the idea of harnessing the muses nine to the chariot of Sam Gompers. A sympathetic strike by the United Novelists of America to raise the wages of master plumbers has a basic element of congruity quite as amusing as the first crude slap of the stick. Art being what she is in so many cases, there is no quick retort to the proposals now pending before the authors and actors of the land.

There is, too, the possibility that the idea is a really sound one, which would work out sanely to the benefit of everybody concerned and would not, in fact, restrict future Dantes and Shelleys to an eight-hour day (with a fine for overtime). The Authors' League has already accomplished some things in the way of discouraging sharp practice at the expense of writers. Organized on a larger scale, with the American Federation of Labor behind them, there is no knowing what it might put through. The history of American copyright is pretty good evidence that art, naked and alone, gets a rather cold hearing in legislative halls.

That is the probable gain. As for the losses, there is always the chance that great minds such as these might run a new and perfect union, with all the undesirable eliminated, with no seniority rules, no strikes, no overpay for incompetents and not so much as the left-hand mustache of a walking delegate. The whole army of unorganized downtrodden readers, jeering to-day, would rush together clamoring for union cards, if the scheme worked.

Will our German-American friends now expect us to return them to Berlin because the German Government has graciously consented to warn German subjects in the United States to renounce violence and obey American laws?

## The Villa Problem.

(From The Boston Traveller.)

Some day, long after the troops have evacuated Mexico by order of Mexican bandits; long after Woodrow Wilson shall have relinquished the Presidency for a privacy in the service of humanity, it is probable that Villa, old, gray-headed and tired of leading a roving life, will entrain for Washington and surrender to the head of the War Department.

What a day of triumph that will be for American arms and American valor! What a tribute it will be to the Mexico policy of the Wilson Administration, from beginning to end! And if Villa should not be too old and feeble at that time to undergo the hardships of a long journey he might be carried all over the country, from one big city to another, as evidence that, although the American nation is very patient and mighty slow to anger, its stern purposes and stern chases cannot forever be ignored or evaded.

But what if, when Villa prepares to give himself up, this nation should have neither War nor Navy departments, and their successor, the Department of Peace, should refuse to accept the surrender? Would Villa be implacably offended by such refusal and might it not lead to new trouble with the country south of us?

## "With All My Worldly Goods."

(From The Philadelphia Ledger.)

The Methodist Episcopal Church some time ago decided to omit "with thou obey" from the marriage service, and now the commission on the revision of the ritual proposes that the formula "With my worldly goods I thee endow" shall go by the board. Certainly it does not mean a great deal in many cases, and it has no binding legal significance. It sounds magnificent when uttered in the presence of a crowded church by a nonconformist or at a rare impetuous benediction, who would have saved for riddings the rice that is thrown after the retreating bridal pair and preserve the old shoes to be resoled. The Methodists decline any longer to countenance the deception. In this era of the new and progressive womanhood the bridegroom is well aware that he is entitled to be supported by his "captured" heiress in a state to which he has not been accustomed.

## MR. HUGHES'S WEAKNESS

## As Candidate He Would Have to Defend Nomination While a Judge.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is not difficult to understand the controlling factors directing the thought of a not inconsiderable number of Republicans to the consideration of Justice Hughes as a suitable candidate for their Presidential nomination in June.

His splendid political record as Governor of New York, his freedom from all entanglement with the rupture of the party in 1912, the fact that his views on all questions likely to create division are unknown, make his selection one requiring the minimum of surrender of past prejudice.

While this reasoning holds good with respect to the June convention it does not require much reflection to discover that probably no candidate prominently considered would be so weak before the people in November.

There is undoubtedly a widespread feeling that an appointment to the Supreme bench should separate the judge definitely and permanently from further political activity, and if nominated Justice Hughes would have to defend through the whole campaign the propriety of his candidacy.

The objections to the nomination of a member of the Supreme Court for President are founded upon sound reasoning. Once let a judge of the court be nominated and elected President there will be a permanent danger of the judges writing opinions with the hope that they will pave the way to similar honors and the still greater danger that the public will attribute such motives even oftener than they exist.

One has only to recall the fate of an admiral in recent years who fell from the highest pinnacle of acclaim almost to obscurity for an unimportant act of bad taste to realize how the distaste of the public for judges in politics might easily of itself destroy what would otherwise be good prospects of success.

To nominate Justice Hughes, aside from establishing an improper and dangerous precedent, would be like "buying a pig in a poke." The issues at stake are new issues, and they are vital issues. The people realize, since Mr. Wilson's Administration, how unimportant platform declarations may be, and to arouse winning support the candidate must himself in himself stand for the policies the voters wish to put into effect.

The Republicans and Progressives would alike discredit their earnestness of purpose and declare themselves rank opportunists if they nominated a candidate whose views on all the striking issues of the day are as utterly unknown as are those of Justice Hughes.

A candidate may possibly "pussfoot" into the nomination for President in June, but no party can "pussfoot" into the Presidency in this November election.

For these reasons it seems to me quite certain that the Republican convention will, in the spirit typified by The Tribune, put the past behind and, looking to the present and the future, select the candidate who measures up to the needs of the hour—who can command a million votes uncontrolled by party ties—who can be elected and who probably is the only candidate that can be elected. This language can apply to no other than Colonel Roosevelt.

LESLIE COMBS.

Lexington, Ky., May 8, 1916.

## Choice of the Opposing Candidates.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A few days ago a letter appeared in your columns from F. C. Owen making the statement that fifteen out of every twenty Democrats desire to see Roosevelt nominated by the Republican party, the inference being that the Democrats regard him as the easiest man to defeat. This is so far contrary to the actual fact that I am led to write this to you. As a matter of fact, Theodore Roosevelt is the one man whom Democrats as a rule do not want to see nominated, believing that with a reunited party the defeat of Wilson would be inevitable. I have occasion to talk with a great many Democrats and have heard directly and indirectly from many others, and practically no one of them has looked with any favor on the nomination of Roosevelt. In fact, it has been almost ludicrous the expressions of opinion in favor of the nomination of some obscure or practically unknown favorite son.

Whenever a Democrat has been found who wished the nomination of Roosevelt it was because he himself desired to vote for the Colonel and against Wilson. Substantial evidence of the fact that Democrats do not want Roosevelt is found in the gratuitous and "inspiring" boomerang which "The New York Times" and "The New York World" have recently been giving Hughes. With the sentiment of the "old guard" that Roosevelt must be killed off politically at any cost, the Democratic party is in full accord.

Stamford, Conn., May 16, 1916. H. H. G.

## The Two Bs.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As a true and tried Republican I want my party to win this time. I see things clearly—and, besides, I am well advised.

Neither Roosevelt nor Hughes can carry New York against Wilson. It would be a political mistake to nominate either one. We should go to the Middle West for our candidate for President and the Far West for our candidate for Vice-President.

Politically Roosevelt is weaker with the voters to-day than he ever was.

The best ticket the Republicans can nominate is Burton and Borah.

HENRY E. RUSSELL.

New York, May 15, 1916.

## The Bible on Preparedness.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"—Cor., xiv, 8.

"Prepare the table, watch in the watch tower, eat, drink, arise ye princes, and anoint the shield. For thus hath the Lord said unto me, go set a watchman, let him declare what he seeth."—Isaiah, xxi, 5-6.

"Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, prepare ye the highway; gather out the stones, lift up a standard for the people."—Isaiah, lxxii, 10.

Preparedness appears to have been quite the vogue in the days of Christ and of the old prophets. JOHN EDWARD BRUCE.

Yonkers, N. Y., May 16, 1916.

## Punished for What?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Were the officers of the submarine that torpedoed the Sussex punished for violating orders or punished for failure to sink the vessel?

FROM MISSOURI.

Hoboken, N. J., May 15, 1916.

## "BEING MERELY AMERICAN, I'VE NOTHING TO SAY."



## "A NOTE TO BRITAIN"

## America Is Pro-Ally, Despite the Blockade, a Reader Believes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial this morning "A Note to Britain" seems fully justified in its chief contention, which I understand to be that the British government or people should set plainly before the American people the justification of the blockade and of their interference with commerce arising from it. It is true that they have not explained their position as clearly as they should have done, particularly in view of the strong pressure being constantly brought to bear on our nation by those who are hostile to England.

I think, however, you exaggerate the feeling of enmity toward England in this country, and you appear to take no notice of the sentiment of a large, probably the larger, proportion of the people of this country, which condemns England's enemies as responsible in the main for the outbreak of the war. Rightly or wrongly, a large part of the American people who have given any thought to the subject believe that this greatest of all wars started through Austria sending to Serbia a list of demands, some of which were so harsh that the smaller country could hardly accept them in toto and preserve actual independence.

Nor do many of us overlook the fact that Germany's invasion of Belgium, a state whose neutrality she, as well as England, had sworn not only to respect, but to defend. It is true that in some respects England's interests lay in the direction of maintaining Belgium as an independent state, but it should be recalled that one of the arrangements which Germany tried to make with England, as the price of her keeping out of the war, was that she would annex no Belgian territory if she might only be allowed to violate the neutrality of the little kingdom by marching her army through it in order to attack France where she was unprepared. Most of us honor the stand taken by England that she did not accept such terms and prove false to the oath she had taken. It is these considerations of the starting of the war and the invasion of the peaceful state of Belgium, with all the suffering it entailed, as well as the ruthlessness shown by the Kaiser's government in the method of conducting hostilities, and particularly illustrated in the torpedoing of the Lusitania and sending to death more than a thousand non-combatants, which have swayed public opinion in this country to the side of the Allies. I say to the side of the Allies, not merely to that of Great Britain, for I see no reason why we should obediently follow the lead of the pro-German propagandists who unceasingly proclaim that this war is directed mainly against England. It did not start as such, and it is against France and Belgium and Italy and Serbia and Russia as well as England.

I believe you exaggerate the hostility to England of the three racial sections of our people of which you speak—the old American, the Irish and the German strains. With regard to the first-named I believe the prevailing opinion is overwhelmingly on the side of the Allies; and that in regard to England, it is that we fought our fight with her in 1776 and 1812, and those scores are settled; that we have lived at peace with her for over one hundred years, and side by side with one of her greatest colonies, with 3,000 miles of international boundary between us, and have found her a good neighbor; that when she is in the right in a tremendous war, the issue of which no man can foresee, we have no right to embarrass her unless she gives us grave cause.

With regard to the Irish-Americans, I know that the larger portion of those whom I have met have been on the side of the Allies. Regret, there doubtless is, not only among them but among other Americans, that the extreme penalty was inflicted on some of the Dublin rebels, but is there any reason to suppose that Germany in such a case would have been less drastic? Suppose such an attempt at revolution had flared out in Posen, on the part of the Poles, or at Zabern, on that of the Alsatians; suppose immense damage had been done to property as a result and that hundreds, including many German soldiers, had been killed. In such a case is there any reason to believe that the Kaiser's government would have been any more merciful with the leaders of the insurrection? However, it would seem at this distance as if it would have been the best as well as by far the most politic.

thing to have shown a leniency similar to that exercised in South Africa, and while keeping the misguided chiefs of the revolution under restraint to have spared their lives.

With respect to the blockade, the interference with commerce, the American people are entitled to know all that can be truthfully said on each side. T. L. COVENTRY.

New York, May 17, 1916.

## Westchester's Water.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial of recent date in reference to the bill now before the Governor giving to the municipalities of Westchester County the right to tap the Ashokan Reservoir is manifestly unfair.

Having been a resident of Mount Vernon for over twenty-eight years and in touch during that time with civic affairs in the county, I know it to be a fact that during that period only three municipalities have had occasion to use New York City water, and then only for a very short time. If this is the past record, it is fair to assume it will be no worse in the future.

Mount Vernon was the greatest sufferer, and yet it had to use New York water for only a few weeks. The great city was not inconvenienced then and it had only the Croton to rely on; now it has the vast supply from the Catskills in addition. Having taken all the available supply from our people, does it not strike you as only fair and just that in time of dire need it should be only too glad to help us out?

We think the health of our people should be conserved just as much as that of greater New York, and under all circumstances it seems almost a crime to deprive us in time of necessity of that great commodity of health and life simply because New York may not have enough. That condition never has existed, and it is fair to assume never will. FRANK M. BUCK.

Mount Vernon, N. Y., May 15, 1916.

## "Had England Failed."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been taking your paper for some years and like it. The attraction to me is the editorial page. I find there more "sense and nonsense" than in any other journal I know. I cannot expect to agree with all you have to say. I frequently disagree. But your articles for the most part are fair. When I find them less than fair—as, for example, in the case of recent editorials on what you call "British Failure"—I do not altogether resent it; but I do confess to a mild type of surprise that this particular form of "nonsense" should find utterance in the editorial columns of a journal published in a country which owes its safety to the fact that England has not failed. Had England failed—or were England likely to fail—not even three thousand miles of intervening ocean could avail to insure the continued publication of your valuable paper. England will not fail; take that to your comfort and consider also some lines of an immortal singer:

"Awake our souls! Away our fears.  
Let every trembling thought be gone;  
Awake (no, you will not need to run)—  
England for that!"

And put a cheerful courage on."  
SAMUEL S. MARTIN.

Toronto, Canada, May 15, 1916.

## Furniture Needed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The response of your readers to a recent letter from our Relief Bureau about the babies of poor mothers who could not afford to buy baby carriages leads me to think that at this season of moving and changes there may be those who would like to give some other articles that could be of much service to us in our several institutions, such as our Caroline Rest Home for mothers and babies, our Sea Breeze Fresh Air Home and Briar Brae Lodge. The sort of articles we most need are floor coverings, rugs, chairs, couches, tables and pictures.

Any such articles which your readers might think would be useful to us should be sent to Briar Brae Lodge, 408 West Twentieth Street, and from there they will be sent to the places where they can be best used.

H. INGRAHAM,  
Superintendent, Bureau of Relief.  
New York, May 11, 1916.

## "THE IRISH FOLLY"

## An Opportunity for a Brave and Truthful Irish Leader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mawkish or not, there are many among those willing to back the British government with their lives who agree with you and regret the severity that characterized the Dublin executions and who at this distance cannot help feeling that some one has blundered.

What the effect will be in Ireland God only knows.

The business of war and its urgency silence many voices in England that would repudiate as unnecessary this supreme vindication of law and order, just as there are many who regret that fate should have placed the fortunes of England at this time of peril in the hands of men who have neither the knowledge to rule nor the courage to admit their inadequacy.

Nevertheless, it is the British people rather than the Irish rebels who have been injured most by the panic of Mr. Asquith and his advisers, and the accounting must be to them. The business of war and its urgency silence many voices in England that would repudiate as unnecessary this supreme vindication of law and order, just as there are many who regret that fate should have placed the fortunes of England at this time of peril in the hands of men who have neither the knowledge to rule nor the courage to admit their inadequacy.

I was in Dublin last December, when the signs of coming trouble were such that even a blind man could see, yet no step was taken to meet the danger. It is idle to say the cause of the rising was a plan to disarm the Volunteers. The dream of Irish freedom—Ireland a nation—Ireland a separate nation—lay heavy on these young men. There was much talk of small nationalities. They pointed to Belgium and its guarantees, to Norway and its position, to Serbia, to Greece. The whole international horizon was canvassed, and it was their belief that this war meant the downfall of the British Empire.

They did not love Germany; they were sorry for France; but the Germans were certain to win—had already won—and the aim of the Young Irelander was to control a seat at the final peace conference and secure independence. England knew this; has always known it. Do Englishmen niggardly deny Home Rule to Ireland? I do not think so. Does the Asquith Home Rule bill satisfy Irishmen? Far from it. It defrauds them, they say.

Even Mr. John Redmond would hardly deny that the men who sent him and his party to Westminster (and Ireland has undergone a change of heart since then, as Mr. Redmond knows, if he remembers his reception in Waterford after his return from the trenches in France) saw in Home Rule merely a step to the broader ground of separation.

The call of the Irish blood is echoed more truly by Mr. John Devoy than by Mr. Shane Leslie, but Mr